

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

1<sup>st</sup> ONE HUNDRED INVESTMENT  
POOL, LLC,

Case No. 2:17-CV-1233 JCM (PAL)

## ORDER

**Plaintiff(s),**

V.

CARMEN J. ROSE, et al.,

**Defendant(s).**

Presently before this court is plaintiff 1st One Hundred Investment Pool, LLC’s emergency motion to extend time to respond to defendants Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company (“BNY”) and Sables, LLC’s (“Sables”) motions to dismiss. (ECF No. 14). BNY filed its motion to dismiss on May 26, 2017, (ECF No. 7) and Sables filed its motion to dismiss on May 30, 2017, (ECF No. 8).

Specifically, plaintiff argues that it does not want to incur legal fees to produce responses to the motions to dismiss before its May 26, 2017, motion to remand is adjudicated. *See* (ECF No. 14). Therefore, plaintiff requests “an order of continuance to file its responses to defendants’ motions to dismiss, or, alternatively, a request for stay of briefing, until its motion for remand is resolved.” (*Id.* at 1).

Plaintiff's requests will be denied for multiple procedural reasons. First, emergency consideration under Local Rule 7-4 is explicitly inapplicable to "requests for procedural relief, e.g., a motion to extend time to file a brief." LR 7-4. Second, the motion to remand is not yet ripe. See (ECF No. 6); *see also* LR 7-2(b). Finally, "[f]or each type of relief requested . . . a separate

1 document must be filed and a separate event must be selected for that document" on the electronic  
2 docketing system. LR IC 2-2(b).

3 Accordingly,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff's emergency  
5 motion (ECF No. 14) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

6 DATED June 7, 2017.

7   
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28